United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/32/ERI/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
7 November 2018

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirty-second session
21 January1 February 2019

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Eritrea*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 19 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

II. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies[2]

2. JS1 urged Eritrea to ratify the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the Second Optional Protocol to International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty and the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.[3]

3. Article 19 stated that Eritrea acceded to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights in 2002. However, the Government of Eritrea was yet to submit its initial report to the Human Rights Committee.[4]

4. JS4 stated that, after years of failing to do so, Eritrea had finally submitted its first report to the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights. However, Eritrea had still not implemented any of the Commission's decisions in relation to freedom of expression and the enforced disappearances of journalists and politicians.[5]

5. Article 19 expressed concern about the lack of implementation by Eritrea of key decisions issued by the African Commission for Human and Peoples' Rights.[6] RSF-RWB stated that Eritrea had not acted on the decision of the Commission in the Dawat Isaak's case.[7]

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

6. JS4 stated that since the previous review, Eritrea had increased its engagement with the international community and had granted access to bilateral and international delegations. However, Eritrea had continued to ignore requests by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea to visit the country in order to assess the human rights situation in accordance with her mandate. The Government of Eritrea had also ignored requests to grant independent experts from regional and international human rights groups the access needed to carry out comprehensive studies on the human rights situation. Those requests included requests from the Special Rapporteurs on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, freedom of religion or belief, the right to food, freedom of opinion and expression, and extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions. JS4 further stated that Eritrea had also refused to meaningfully engage with the Commission of Inquiry.[8] Article 19 recalled that at the previous review, Eritrea had not supported recommendations on the cooperation with the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea and with Special Procedures mandate holders.[9]

7. ICAN noted with appreciation that Eritrea had participated in the negotiation of the United Nations Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear weapons, and voted in favour of its adoption on 7 July 2017. However, Eritrea had not as yet signed the Treaty.[10]

8. JS4 noted that at the previous review, Eritrea had supported a number of recommendations on a variety of issues but that there had not been any discernible progress in the implementation of those recommendations. 11 It called on Eritrea to implement those recommendations.[12]

B. National human rights framework[13]

9. Referring to relevant supported recommendations, IFE stated that Eritrea had not taken any constructive, tangible and transparent steps towards the implementation of the 1997 Constitution or the drafting of a new Constitution.[14]

10. While noting that in 2014, the President of Eritrea had announced the drafting of a new constitution, Article 19 stated that the lack of transparency in this process, including the failure to disclose any draft or ensure effective participation in its development was of concern, compounded by the absence of an elected legislature, independent media or critical civil society.[15]

11. ELS stated that, as a starting point in addressing the deep-seated crisis in promoting and protecting human rights, Eritrea should take measurable and time-bound steps to implement the 1997 Constitution or adopt a new constitution through a democratic and participatory process, reinstate the National Assembly (the transitional parliament), restore the independence and impartiality of the Judiciary, including through the establishment of an independent judicial service commission and separate the courts from the influence of the Ministry of Justice, release prisoners particularly those detained for their political views or religious tendencies, and take other symbolic measures that bolster transition to a full-fledged democratic order, such as preparations for the conduct of free and fair general elections.[16]

12. Article 19 stated that the recent peace agreement between Eritrea and Ethiopia and the restoration of transport and telecommunications channels, was positive.[17] JS3 expressed the hope that the declared end of war between the two nations will not only assist in reducing tensions in the Horn of Africa, but will also encourage Eritrea to demobilize its army, to release all prisoners of conscience, and to grant greater freedoms to its people.[18]

13. JS1 stated that as a consequence of the indefinite military service, a large number of males are fleeing the country, and requested Eritrea to set and implement a reasonable time limit for military service.[19] HRW stated that many national service conscripts were not assigned to the military but were used in civilian capacities, as farm labourers, teachers, construction workers, civil servants, and lower level judges.[20]

14. JS1 stated that despite numerous complaints from the Eritrean diaspora, as well as protests from some European governments, Eritrea had continued to collect the two percent

tax from Eritreans abroad, using methods that excessively penalized those that were unwilling to pay the tax.[21]

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Cross-cutting issues

Development, the environment, and business and human rights[22]

15. MAAT stated that Eritrea had experienced difficult economic conditions as a result of the state of war and insecurity that had characterised the country since its independence in 1993. Eritrea had experienced many difficulties in rebuilding infrastructure and developing its agriculture-based economic. Despite the lack of funding, resources and difficult economic conditions, the Government of Eritrea had worked to ensure food security, a health system, and free education. Disparities between rural and urban areas had also been reduced.[23]

2. Civil and political rights

Right to life, liberty and security of person[24]

16. JS3 welcomed the accession to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment by Eritrea in 2014. However, it noted that the reservations made by the Government of Eritrea included non-recognition of the competence of the Committee against Torture provided for in Article 20 of the Convention, thereby precluding the possibility of a visit by members of the Committee in the event of the receipt of a complaint. In addition, Eritrea declared that it did "not consider itself bound by Article 30, which stipulates that all disputes concerning the interpretation of the Convention shall be referred to the International Court of Justice by one of the parties."[25]

17. HRF stated that although Eritrea was a party to Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the practice of torture was commonly used by the security forces.[26] Furthermore conscripts have served in the military under harsh militarized and enslavement conditions amounting to torture and ill-treatment and women and girls were subjected to rape by military commanders.[27] HRC-E stated that no one had been held accountable for torture.[28]

18. Referring to Article 29 of the Criminal Procedure Code of the State of Eritrea (2015), HRF stated that although arbitrary arrest and detention were prohibited in law, security forces have systematically arrested and detained thousands of people without trial.[29]

19. JS3 stated that arbitrary detention, torture, cruel and inhumane and degrading treatment continue to occur with impunity in detention centres, with tens of thousands of people detained without charge or trial and in life threatening conditions in more than 300 sites across the country.[30] JS4 stated that in many cases, detention amounted to enforced disappearance since the authorities had refused to confirm the arrest, whereabouts or fate of missing persons.[31]

20. JS4 stated that the political leaders and journalists who had been arrested in the September 2001 crackdown, remained in "incommunicado" detention. Although their whereabouts had never been officially confirmed, the politicians and at least some of the journalists had reportedly been detained in Eiraeiro, a high security prison, which was purpose-built to hold them, in a remote location north of Asmara-Massawa road.[32]

21. JS4 stated that prison conditions had fallen far short of international standards and had amounted to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. Prisoners had often been held in underground cells or shipping containers, in desert locations and had been subjected to extremes of heat and cold. Food, water and sanitation had been scarce.[33]

22. HRC-E stated that Eritrea imposed severe restrictions on its citizens leaving the country, which was in violation of Article 12 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. It stated that the "shoot to kill" commands given to border guards was reprehensible and violated human rights principles observed by human and civilized societies.[34]

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law[35]

23. ELS stated that Eritrea had not had an independent Judiciary since 1993. The Judiciary has "suffered" from "attacks" emanating from the Office of the State President, the Minister of Justice under whose direct authority the judicial branch operates, and from other arms of the executive branch, including the army and the secret police. Judges and other members of the legal profession, including public prosecutors and lawyers in practice, were not immune from abhorrent forms of abuses. Furthermore, in some cases court judgments had been reversed by military commanders and influential politicians.[36]

24. Article 19 expressed concern that the absence of an independent judiciary had enabled total impunity for violations and abuses of civil and political rights, including the rights to freedom of expression, religion or belief, association, and peaceful assembly.[37] HRC-E stated widespread impunity had flouted the rule of law.[38]

25. HRC-E stated that as a consequence of the lack of an independent judiciary, human rights cases, such as the cases of the "G15 ministers and journalists" arrested in 2001, and other persons arrested by the national security authorities on the orders of the President could not be heard.[39]

26. ELS stated that the Special Court of Eritrea was accountable only to the President and enjoyed absolute power. The Special Court had become a tool of the President used against his political opponents. The Special Court had rendered judgments without due regard to universally recognized principles, such as the right to appeal and the right to legal counsel. The Special Court had the power to overturn the judgments of the ordinary courts.[40] HRC-E stated that the existence of the Special Court was incompatible with any independent system of justice.[41]

27. Article 19 stated that in May 2015, Eritrea enacted a new penal code,[42] and criminal procedure code,[43] which ostensibly replaced the Transitional Penal Code, established under emergency powers in 1991. The new codes replicated many of the provisions found in the Transitional Penal Code, in effect entrenching emergency powers within ordinary law. A number of overly broad provisions in the new penal code did not comply with the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights or the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.[44]

28. HRW stated that the new penal code guarantees a right to independent judicial habeas corpus proceedings, but they were yet to be applied and tested.[45]

29. HRW stated that there were frequent arrests based on suspicion and those arrested were seldom informed of the reason for their arrest. Incarceration can be indefinite and is often incommunicado. Relatives were not informed about the whereabouts of a prisoner, much less allowed to visit.[46]

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life[47]

30. ADF stated that only four religious denominations, the Eritrean Orthodox Church, the Roman Catholic Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church and Sunni Islam, were recognised in law. Religious adherence, association and practice beyond those denominations were prohibited and punishable by law.[48]

31. ADF stated that even the four authorised religious dominations were not free from government censorship and government control.[49]

32. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review pertaining to the freedom of religion or belief, JS3 stated that several hundred Christians from non-sanctioned churches were detained indefinitely, and arrests had continued during the period under review. Government sanctioned churches had also faced repression and

harassment. In 2017, members of the Muslim community had been arrested for opposing the attempted expropriation of the AL Diaa private Islamic school by the Government of Eritrea.[50]

33. EAJW stated that there was no provision for conscientious objection in Eritrea.[51] HRW stated that there was no other service that could be substitutes for military service for conscientious objectors.[52] EAJW stated that in cases where Johovah's Witnesses expressed conscientious objection to military service, they were indefinitely detained without charge or trial and were usually tortured.[53]

34. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, IFE stated that Eritrea had not introduced policy or had taken any other measures to ensure the freedoms of expression, opinion and assembly.[54]

35. JS4 stated that there had been no discernible progress in implementing the supported recommendations relating to the freedom of expression.[55] Referring to relevant supported recommendations, Article 19 stated that no progress had been made to bring the Constitution or national laws restricting freedom of expression in compliance with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.[56] JS4 noted that the new Penal Code criminalized defamation and insult, and severely restricted critical discourse on religion.[57]

36. Article 19 stated that no independent media existed, notwithstanding Eritrea's support for relevant recommendations from the previous review.[58] Media outlets were limited to the state newspaper, the state television station, and three state-run radio stations. Reports that the National Security Office was considering restricting access to satellite television channels, further threatened to reduce access to the already limited sources of independent information in the country.[59] Referring to relevant supported recommendations, EHAHRDP stated that the authorities had periodically jammed satellite radio transmissions by opposition groups.[60]

37. EHAHRDP stated that Eritrea had continued to quash dissenting views and opinions. Some journalists had been imprisoned while others had gone into exile.[61] JS2 stated that many journalists had been detained and kept in undisclosed locations, isolated and not allowed visits.[62]

38. JS2 stated that the 2005 Proclamation Determining the Administration of Non-Governmental Organisations heavily censored civil society organizations, imposes onerous reporting guidelines and empowers the authorities to exert control over the activities of those organisations.[63]

39. ELS stated that it was the only professional association of Eritrean lawyers and that it was currently in exile. It stated that attempts to establish itself within the country had been frustrated by the secret police. ELS stated that the very fact of its existence in exile conveyed volumes about the level of repression suffered by the legal profession in Eritrea.[64]

40. EHAHRDP stated that there were no functional independent national or international non-governmental organizations in Eritrea, adding that the Non-Governmental Organisation Administration Proclamation (2005) was placing severe restrictions on non-governmental organizations, including on the amount of funding they may receive from the United Nations or bilateral agencies. The Proclamation also required that donor funds flowed through the Government.[65]

41. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, EHAHRDP stated that the operating environment for human rights defenders had remained extremely harsh, forcing many to flee the country.[66] Friends and family members of Human Rights Defenders in exile had been subjected to security threats, a form of reprisal related to "guilt by association."[67]

Right to privacy and family life

42. JS2 stated that where Eritreans in exile had participated in peaceful protests against the action of the Eritrean Government in their country of exile, their family members in Eritrea were a risk of being targeted by the authorities.[68]

3. Economic, social and cultural rights

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

43. While noting that the Labour Proclamation No 118/2001 guarantees the rights of citizens, employers and employees to form associations and to participate in their activities, JS2 stated that in practice there were no independent associations and unions. It added that the National Confederation of Eritrean Workers, which was the only operational union in Eritrea, was controlled by the state.[69]

Right to social security

44. JS1 stated that when Eritreans living abroad did not pay the diaspora tax, their family members in Eritrea were denied access to services and to food vouchers, as well as access to remittances from their relatives who were abroad.[70]

Right to an adequate standard of living[71]

45. EI L stated that the recurrent draughts and the ill-managed economy and land policy had resulted in a lack of adequate food reserves, but that Eritrea had refused assistance from humanitarian and relief organizations.[72]

46. HRW stated that the pay for those persons under going their national service was inadequate. Despite an increase in 2016, it remained insufficient to support a family.[73]

47. IFE stated that in 2015 and in 2016, the Government demolished more than 2000 houses, adding that the victims had not been able to challenge the demolition of their homes because of a lack of an appropriate mechanism to consider such challenges.[74]

Right to education[75]

48. EAJW stated that high school students who completed 11th grade were obliged to register at the Sawa military camp to complete their 12th grade education. It noted that young Jehovah's Witnesses could not complete their education because of their conscientious objection to military service.[76]

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women[77]

49. ELL stated that women suffered as consequence of being drafted into the military to complete their compulsory military service. They had been subjected to forced labour, and risked being raped by senior military officers.[78]

Children[79]

50. MAAT stated that efforts had been made by Eritrea to ensure the rights of children, including through the development of a national strategy aimed at providing an appropriate environment for children.[80]

51. HRC-E stated that although the national service legislation had set the minimum age for national service conscription at 18 years, many children below that age had been recruited for national service.[81]

52. GIEACPC stated that corporal punishment was prohibited as a sentence for a crime but remained lawful in the home, in alternative and day care settings, in schools and in penal institutions. It called for the enactment of legislation to explicitly prohibit corporal punishment in all settings, including in the home. It also called for all legal defences for the use of corporal punishment, including those prescribed in the penal code, to be repealed.[82]

Minorities and indigenous peoples

53. HRW stated that in 2015, traditional Afar land near Assab had been "confiscated" and used for the construction of a military base for occupation by a third country with no compensation paid to the Afar leaders.[83]

Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons[84]

54. ELL stated that thousands of people, especially youth, had continued to leave the country for reasons which included avoiding the compulsory and indefinite military service.[85]

Stateless persons

55. EAJW stated that the Presidential Degree of 25 October 1994 had revoked the citizenship of those Jehovah's Witnesses who were Eritrean by birth for their refusal to participate in the referendum and to undertake military service.[86]

Notes

[1] The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org.

Civil society

Individual submissions:

ADF	ADF International, Geneva, Switzerland;
Article 19	ARTICLE 19, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
EAJW	The European Association of Jehovah's Witnesses, Brussels, Belgium;
EHAHRDP	East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Kampala, Uganda;
ELL	Eritrean Lowlander's League, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
ELS	Eritrean Law Society, Oakland, United States of America;
GIEACPC	Eritrean Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
HRF	Eritrean Human Rights Foundation, New York, United States of America;
HRC-E	Human Rights Concern-Eritrea, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
HRW	Human Rights Watch, Geneva, Switzerland;
ICAN	International Campaign to abolish nuclear weapons, Geneva, Switzerland;
IFE	Information Forum for Eritrea, Geneva, Switzerland;
IFOR	International Fellowship of Reconciliation, Geneva, Switzerland;
MAAT	Maat Foundation for Peace, Development and Human Rights, Cairo, Egypt;
RSF-RWB	Reporters without borders, Paris, France.

Joint submissions:

JS1	Centre for Global Nonkilling, Geneva, Switzerland; Conscience and Peace Tax International, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; and Release Eritrea (Joint Submission 1);
JS2	Civicus, Johannesburg, South Africa, Eritrean Movement for Democracy and Human Rights and Eritrea Focus (Joint Submission 2);
JS3	Christian Solidarity Worldwide – UK and Christian Solidarity Worldwide-Nigeria, (Joint Submission 3);
JS4	Pen Eritrea, Committee to Protect Journalists and Pen International, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Joint Submission 4).

[2] For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/26/13, paras. 122.1-122.21, 122.23-122.29, 122.51-122.53, 122.72-122.74, 122.76-122.106 and 122.199.

[3] JS1, p. 4.

[4] Article 19, para. 8 Article 19 made recommendations (para. 11).

[5] JS4, para. VII.

[6] Article 19, para. 9. Article 19 made recommendations (para. 11).

[7] RSF-RWB, p. 2.
[8] JS4, paras. viii and ix ; See also Article 19, para. 7. Article 19 made recommendations (para. 11); EHAHRDP, paras. 5(a)-(e). EHAHRDP made recommendations (para. 6.4); JS2. para. 5.5; and RSF-RWB, p. 3.)
[9] Article 19, para. 7, referring to A/HRC/26/13, para. 122.72 (Netherlands), para. 122.77 (Portugal), para. 122.78 (Tunisia), para. 122.80 (Germany), para. 122.83 (Latvia), para. 122.84 (Somalia), para. 122.85 (Uruguay), para. 122.86 (Republic of Korea), para. 122.87 (Ireland), para. 122.88 (Portugal), para. 122.89 (Czech Republic), para. 122.90 (Brazil), para. 122.91 (Norway), para. 122.92 (Romania), para. 122.93 (South Sudan), para. 122.94 (Togo), para. 122.95 (Italy), para. 122.96. (Montenegro), para. 122.97 (Sweden), para. 122.99 (Portugal), para.122.100. (Namibia), para. 122.101 (France), para. 122.102 (Australia), para. 122.103 (Botswana), para. 122.104 (Belgium) and para 122.105 (Namibia); read together with A/HRC/26/13/Add.1.
[10] ICAN, p. 1. ICAN made a recommendation (p. 1).
[11] JS4, paras. iv and v.
[12] JS4, p. 10.
[13] For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/26/13, paras. 122.22, 122.30-122.38, 122.41-122.50, 122.54-122.63, 122.65-122.71, 122.75, 122.107, 122.111, 122.143, 122.162, 122.175-122.177, 122.196, 122.197 and 122.200.
[14] IFE, p. 4, referring to A/HRC/26/13, para. 122.31 (Tunisia) and para. 122.41 (Ghana); read together with A/HRC/26/13/Add.1. IFE made recommendations (p. 5).
[15] Article 19, para. 14. Article 19 made recommendations (para. 24); See also HRW, p. 2.
[16] ELS, paras. 15 and 16.
[17] Article 19, para. 4. See also JS1, p. 10.
[18] JS3, para. 5. JS3 made a recommendation (para. 47).
[19] JS1, pp. 4-5; See also HRW, p. 2. HRW made recommendations (p. 3).
[20] HRW, p. 3. See also IFOR, pp. 1-2.
[21] JS1, p. 7.
[22] For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/26/13, para. 122.198.
[23] MAAT, p. 3.
[24] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/13, paras. 122.116-122.122, 122.134-122.142, 122.145-122.151.
[25] JS3, para. 7.
[26] HRF, para. 14. HRF made a recommendation (para. 24 (e).
[27] Ibid, para. 22. HRF made a recommendation (para. 24 (f).
[28] HRC-E, p. 4. HRC-E made recommendations (p. 4).
[29] HRF, para. 10 and fn. 12. HRF made recommendations (paras. 24 (a) –(c).
[30] JS3, para. 7. JS3 made recommendations (paras. 40-43); See also ELL, p. 3; JS4, para. xix.
[31] JS4, para. xix.
[32] Ibid, para. xxv.
[33] Ibid, para. xxxiv.
[34] HRC-E, p. 2. HRC-E made recommendations (p. 2). See also HRW, p. 5.
[35] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/13, paras. 122.144, 122.152 and 122.153.
[36] ELS, paras. 4 and 5.
[37] Article 19, para. 21.
[38] HRC-E, p. 1.
[39] Ibid, p. 1.
[40] ELS, paras. 8-10.
[41] HRC-E, p. 2. HRC-E made recommendations (p. 2).
[42] Article 19, para. 15 and fn. 12 referring to Penal Code of the State Eritrea, 2015; [unofficial English translation] available at: http://www.ilo.org/dyn/natlex/docs/ELECTRONIC/101051/121587/F567697075/ERI101051%20Eng.pdf.
[43] Ibid, para. 15 and fn. 13 referring to Criminal Procedure Code of the State of Eritrea, 2015; [unofficial English translation] available at: http://www.ilo.org/dyn/natlex/docs/ELECTRONIC/101053/121589/F-308052584/ERI101053%20Eng.pdf
[44] Ibid, paras. 15 and 16. Article 19 made recommendations (para. 24).
[45] HRW, p. 2.
[46] Ibid, p. 5. HRW made recommendations, p. 6.
[47] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/13, paras. 122.39, 122.40, 122.64, 122.154-122.161, 122.163-122.168.
[48] ADF, para. 5. ADF made recommendations (para. 12).

[49] Ibid, para. 6. ADF made recommendations (para. 12). See also HRC-E, p. 3. HRC-E made recommendations (pp. 3-4); HRW, p. 2.
[50] JS3, paras. 12-29, JS3 made a recommendation (para. 39); See also HRF, paras. 20 and 21.
[51] EAJW, para. 18.
[52] HRW, p. 2.
[53] EAJW, para. 18. EAJW made a recommendation (para. 23(3).
[54] IFE, p. 2, A/HRC/26/13, para. 122.160 (Belgium), para. 122.162 (Botswana) and para 122.168 (Tunisia); read together with A/HRC/26/13/Add.1.
[55] JS4, para. xi; See also RSF-RWB, p. 3.
[56] Article 19, para. 12, referring to A/HRC/26/13, para. 122.22 (Czech Republic), para. 122.107 (Mexico), para. 122.31 (Tunisia), para. 122.32 (Uruguay), para. 122.41 (Ghana), para. 122.43 (Philippines), para. 122.158 (Japan), para. 122.159 (Lithuania), para. 122.160 (Belgium), and para. 122.162 (Botswana); read together with A/HRC/26/13/Add.1.
[57] Ibid 19, paras. 18 and 19.
[58] Ibid, para. 25 and fn. 19, referring to A/HRC/26/13, para. 122.67 (Canada) and para. 122.152 (Belgium); read together with A/HRC/26/13/Add.1.
[59] Ibid, para. 29. Article 19 made recommendations, para. 35; See also EHAHRDP, para. 2 (c), ELL, p. 4, JS2, para. 5.4, HRC-E, pp. 2-3. HRC-E made recommendations (p. 3); JS4, para. Xiii; RSF-RWB, para. 1; MAAT, p. 4.
[60] EHAHRDP, para. 2(c).
[61] Ibid, paras. 2(d) – (h). EHAHRDP made recommendations (para. 6.1).
[62] JS2, para. 4.3. JS2 cited specific cases (paras. 4.8-4.11). JS2 made recommendations (para. 5.4); See also HRF, paras. 17-19.
[63] Ibid, para. 2.3. JS2 made recommendations (para. 5.1).
[64] ELS, paras. 1 and 7.
[65] EHAHRDP, para. 2 (c).
[66] Ibid, paras 4 (a) and (b), fn. 22 and fn.23, referring to A/HRC/26/13, para. 122.152 (Belgium) and para. 122.168 (Tunisia); read together with A/HRC/26/13/Add.1.
[67] Ibid, para. 2 (e). EHAHRDP made recommendations (para. 6.3).
[68] JS2, para. 2.10.
[69] Ibid, para. 2.4. JS2 made recommendations (para. 5.1).
[70] JS1, p. 7.
[71] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/13, paras. 122.169-122.172, 122.174 and 122.178.
[72] ELL, p. 7.
[73] HRW, p. 3.
[74] IFE, p. 2. IFE made recommendations (p. 2).
[75] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/13, paras. 122.184-122.194.
[76] EAJW, para. 21. EAJCW made a recommendation (para. 23 (3); See also ELL, pp. 6-7.
[77] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/13, paras. 122.108-122.110, 122.112-122.114, 122.125-122.133.
[78] ELL, pp. 4-5.
[79] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/13, paras. 122.123, 122.124 and 122.173.
[80] MAAT, p. 3.
[81] HRC-E, p. 4.
[82] GIEACPC, p. 2.
[83] HRW, p. 5.
[84] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/13, para. 122.195.
[85] ELL, p. 5.
[86] EAJW, para. 4.